

DIGNITY FUND OVERSIGHT AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE
December 4th, 2017; 3:00pm to 5:00pm
1650 Mission Street, 5th Floor, Golden Gate Conference Room

Minutes

Attending: Marcy Adelman, Margy Baran, Ramona Davies, Jessica Lehman, Elinor Lurie, Sandy Mori, Allen Ng, Gustavo Serina, Monique Zmuda, Melissa McGee (DAAS), Tiffany Kearney (DAAS)

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Roll Call: Ms. McGee called roll. The excused OAC absence was Beverly Taylor. Ramona Davies announced that Neil Sims is no longer on the OAC.

Approval of the Agenda: Members unanimously approved the OAC meeting agenda for December 4th, 2017.

Approval of the Minutes: Members unanimously approved the October 16th 2017 minutes.

Needs Assessment Project Update: Presented by Jacqueline Chan and Kira Gunther of RDA. Ms. Gunther delivered a power point presentation to all in attendance. The overall goals and objectives of the Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment (DFCNA) were reviewed and summarized as follows: Conduct a participatory process rooted in robust data collection that will identify the strengths, opportunities, challenges, and gaps present in the current landscape to support an equitable and data-informed service and allocation plan. The data collection encompasses community forums, surveys and focus groups.

RDA reported that a community forum was held in each of the supervisor districts, eleven forums in total, and they were all well attended. There were 547 attendees in total, with diverse demographics as evidence by the demographic data provided in the surveys completed by the attendees. An OAC member asked how many attendees returned the survey. Approximately 500 surveys were returned and RDA noted that each forum had a raffle to encourage attendees to complete the demographic survey. An OAC member commented that the community based organizations (CBO) that hosted forums did a good job in promoting them to their consumers.

Several OAC members requested RDA to share the types of comments and themes that were common among the forums. RDA reported that difficulty navigating services and trouble using paratransit were common concerns expressed by attendees. Another theme noted was a lack of awareness about services and programs supported by DAAS in the community.

An OAC member reported that the community was dissatisfied with the quality of the translation provided at some of the forums and there was discontentment in the community that neither Korean nor Japanese were on the threshold language list. Cindy Kauffman,

Deputy Director of DAAS responded and stated that because DAAS staff attended all of the forums, the translation concerns were quickly realized and addressed.

OAC members expressed the desire for the focus groups to have sound participation that generates in depth conversation about the needs in the community. Another member of the OAC commented that in addition to having a citywide overview of the top issues/concerns, a break down by district would be informative and useful when developing recommendations for service allocation plans.

An OAC member asked how many supervisors attended the community forums. Melissa McGee responded with the following stats: nine supervisors attended, and out of those nine, two supervisors stayed for the entire forum, one supervisor sent an aid, one supervisor did not attend nor send representative.

RDA reviewed the three ways the community survey was being completed: (1) online, (2) paper based, and (3) phone. There have been over seven hundred online survey responses; roughly 30% of the survey responses were from providers and of the remaining, roughly 70% are from older adults. Ms. Gunther explained that due to the lower than desired response rate from the adult with disabilities (AWD), they are targeting the AWD population in the phone survey. Several OAC members expressed concern about the lack of AWD responses. RDA noted that although they would like to get more survey responses and will actively continue to try until the survey closes on December 8th, there are enough surveys from the AWD population to have a convenience sample. Cindy Kauffman requested that members of the OAC, service providers working group and the dignity fund coalition to please continue to promote and share with their networks. An OAC member asked if it the consumer survey was shared on social media. DAAS and RDA answered yes and noted it was on the DAAS website and some CBO websites. It was asked by an OAC member how the paper surveys are being returned to RDA/DAAS. DAAS stated surveys have been returned to DAAS by the USPS but the vast majority of surveys are being returned to DAAS by CBOs and/or DAAS is picking up the paper surveys from CBOs.

RDA was asked by the OAC to share any short falls in districts and/or populations with respect to the number of surveys returned. RDA reported that district 2, 6, 10 and 11 each have less than 30 responses. There also have been less than 30 surveys returned in which respondents identified as African American. The number of translated surveys, specifically Russian, Tagalog, and Vietnamese are low, each less than 5. A member of OAC asked about the number of surveys returned from the LGBT population. The answer provided by RDA was 100. The general consensus of the OAC was the need to obtain more surveys from seniors and adults with disabilities. RDA and DAAS have been and will continue to reach out to district supervisors, CBOs, religious organizations, etc. to encourage the distribution of the survey and promote participation. RDA also explained that the focus groups will help hone in on specific populations to gather more data for the community needs assessment.

OAC members requested clarification on the number and type of focus groups scheduled. RDA referred to the list included in the meeting materials provided by DAAS. They are 30 groups targeting various populations. Two thirds of the focus groups have either already occurred or are scheduled. The remaining third will be scheduled with the designated CBO. An OAC member asked if it has been difficult to get participation and the answer was no. RDA stated that all of the focus groups have been well attended. RDA also mentioned that over attended focus groups can be problematic because they can be more difficult to manage and the information obtained may be less relevant. OAC members emphasized the need to also have diversified attendance within specific population focus groups.

Conversation followed about the best practices and lessons learned through the DFCNA process. An OAC member acknowledged that DAAS has committed to keep record of what has worked well and what has not worked during this process. Concern about service providers not having an opportunity to review survey before it went live was expressed by the OAC. DAAS acknowledged that concern and explained that the condensed time line in the dignity fund legislation in this first year, significantly impacted DAAS and RDA's ability to get as much input from service providers as they would have liked. DAAS will have the ability with the next DFCNA due in four years (FY 21/22) to involve providers more in the development of the survey.

Jacqueline Chan with RDA next reviewed the objectives and timeline for the equity analysis. RDA has implemented an evidence-based and data driven approach. RDA has obtained from DAAS enrollment level data of over 65,000 consumers of which approximately 34,000 are unique consumers with demographic data. DAAS commented that there is a significant amount of missing consumer demographic information and emphasized the importance of service providers obtaining consumer data. The program and consumers data on Ca.GetCare plays a crucial role in helping shape the DFCNA. Both OAC and RDA acknowledged the planning team for generating the needed reports.

Ms. Chan shared with the OAC the equity factors that will be used the equity analysis: They were social isolation, limited English proficiency, low-income, ethnic minority status, sexual orientation, and gender identity. These equity factors were determined using evidence based research and data. Members of the OAC requested that the service providers working group be presented with the results of the community engagement process, i.e. community forums, focus groups, surveys, etc. Another OAC member requested that data available by district level would be very informative. An OAC member also commented that the equity factors would be most useful if applied one or two at a time, not all together. It was asked by a member of service providers working group, what the desired outcome is of the CNA/equity analysis. The responses from RDA and other OAC members included to create a bench mark, to help address identified gaps, to shape future RFPs, and to direct funding. A member of the DAAS team also stated that the DFCNA will provide valuable information for future allocation plans.

An OAC member expressed concern about seniors and adults with disability not knowing they are eligible for DAAS programming and believes that many have the impression that if they are not low income, they cannot access services. Another OAC member noted that there is no income verification with Title III and that the city can define low income status beyond the federal poverty line for the dignity fund services because it is general funding.

Ramona Davies opened the discussion to the public in attendance. An attendee asked how RDA is able to reach the socially isolated populations. RDA acknowledged that isolation is a more challenging equity factor than some of the others however both the quantitative and qualitative data obtained through the needs assessment process will capture the needed information about this group of seniors and adults with disabilities.

Financial Tracking Tool for Prop I Funds: Presented by Rashi Kesarwani. Ms. Kesarwani presented detail on the total FY17-18 Dignity Fund budget and expenditures from July to December 2017. It was explained that the DF budget of 66.1 million in FY17-18 comprised 3 different funding sources. The included the DF baseline funding of 38 million, the FY17-18 DF new allocation of \$6 million, and supplemental funding for DF eligible services such as 16/17 and 17/18 addbacks and OAA funding, totaling \$22 million. The majority of the \$66 million dollar budget is in contracts to vendors, approximately 84%. A small percentage of the budget (6%) is for DAAS salary, and the remaining 10% is to be contracted to vendors and many of these will be in contract in the next couple of months. A member of the OAC asked if all of the addbacks were ongoing. Ms. Kesarwani stated the vast majority are ongoing. Another OAC member commented that the percentage being allocated to DAAS salary was impressively low and also asked if that percentage was reflective of DAAS contractors. The answer was no, the 6% was strictly DAAS staffing. The OAC member asked if the administrative cost for all contracts was something that was readily available. DAAS staff stated that the administrative costs are outline in each of the grantee's budgets. There is not a summary table with each grantee's administrative cost for each of their grantee agreements.

RFP and Modification Update: Because time was running short, this agenda item was postponed until the next meeting.

Announcements: None

Public Comment: No additional public comments

Adjournment: 5:05 p.m.

Next meeting: Monday, 1/22/18, 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
1650 Mission Street, 5th Floor
Golden Gate Conference Room